

REVISED City of Lafayette Staff Report

For: Planning Commission
By: Greg Wolff, Senior Planner
Date Written: January 11, 2007 • Revised January 17, 2007 (strikeout & underline)
Meeting Date: January 18, 2007
Subject: **HDP97-06 ERIC STRAND (APPLICANT & OWNER), LR-10 ZONING:**
 Request for: (1) Hillside Development Permit pursuant to Section 6-2015 of the Lafayette Municipal Code (LMC), (2) Design Review approval pursuant to Section 6-1903 LMC, and (3) Grading permit pursuant to Chapter 3-7 LMC to construct a new, approximately ~~3,500~~ 4,000 sq.ft. one-story single-family residence with basement with a maximum ridge height of approximately 29-ft. above existing grade on a 5.3-acre vacant parcel in the Hillside Overlay District on Burton Ridge at 10 Vista del Valle off Michael Lane. APN 238-080-035 (Reference previously withdrawn application HDP83-05).

Statutory Deadline: March 9, 2007 (without PSA extension)

JANUARY 17, 2007 REVISIONS

When preparing to distribute hard copies of the original staff report and plans, staff discovered additional submittal amongst the full size plans that warrant revision of the staff report. Revisions are made in strikeout-and-underline text with a vertical line in the margin for ease of identification. The bulk of the report remains unchanged.

SUMMARY OF REQUEST

Trigger	Yes	No	Trigger	Yes	No
Within a protected ridgeline setback?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Grading > 50 cu.yds.?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Within 100-ft. of a ridgeline setback?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	DR required as condition of approval?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
In the Hillside Overlay District?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	In a commercial or MFR zone?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Over 17-ft. in height to ridge?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Variance requested?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
SFR Development > 6,000 sq.ft.?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Tree Permit Requested?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Requests:

1. Hillside Development Permit for development within the Hillside Overlay District
2. Design Review for structures over 17 ft. in height
3. Grading Permit for grading of approximately 1,200 cubic yards (900 CY export)

Scope:

- New one-story single-family residence with basement and attached garage on vacant lot
- New driveway and extension of private road “Vista del Valle” in access easement
- Grading & Landscaping

Final Action:

- The Planning Commission will take final action on the subject application pursuant to §6-2065(b)(1) LMC. The Design Review Commission is recommending approval of the design presented to it, subject to several items returning to the DRC prior to issuance of permits.

STATUS

The Planning Commission considered this application in October and found the application to be lacking specific information necessary for the Planning Commission to make an informed evaluation of the project. (Please see November 29, 2006 email from Mike Mussano for written response to each item listed below. Staff comments follow in italics.)

1. **Plans do not provide a 2,500 sq.ft. design** The plans do not contain a 2,500 sq.ft. design as stipulated by the Planning Commission on May 19, 2005, in conjunction with siting determination for the subject residence, the Planning Commission found that: "Recognizing that there is a relationship between house size and the impacts it creates, and that the subject parcel is very heavily constrained, the house shall be no larger than 2,000 square feet plus 2-car garage [~500 sq.ft.] unless the applicant can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission that a larger home would have no additional impacts." *The plans submitted December 22, 2006 show a 2,500 sq.ft. design.*
2. **No analysis or exhibits had been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed ~4,000 sq.ft. residence would have no additional impacts beyond a 2,500 sq.ft. design.** Submit an assessment of the impacts of a 4,000 sq.ft. design as compared to the 2,500 sq.ft. design including, but not limited to grading, drainage and off-site visibility. The Commission understood that Ward Young Architects had completed a similar visual analysis for the Cocotis project on Hawk Canyon Place, including two or more sets of story poles (of differing colors) and photo simulations of the same. *The plans submitted December 22, 2006 compare grading for the ~4,000 sq.ft. and ~2,500 sq.ft. designs. ~~No analysis or change in the drainage plan is shown.~~ No off site visibility analysis was submitted comparing the two designs. Separate elevation drawings were submitted with the outline of the other design shown in a dashed line.*
3. **Application lacked CCCFPD approval of the turn around.** The plans show and the October 25, 2006 letter from Ward Young Architects references a "required 'Engine Company' turnaround at the convergence of the roadway and our driveway". However, no evidence has been submitted to the Planning Services Division that shows the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District has reviewed and approved said turnaround. Submit a letter from the CCCFPD or a site plan with proposed grades showing a CCCFPC approval stamp. *The plans submitted December 22, 2006 show a note on the driveway stating "Fire District Approved Turnaround." ~~However, no evidence has been submitted to the Planning Services Division that shows the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District has reviewed and approved said turnaround in the form of a signed letter or a stamped site plan from the CCCFPD. Staff has referred the driveway design to the CCCFPD and is awaiting comments.~~ The applicant has submitted a letter from the Contra Costa County Fire Protection District conditionally approving the turnaround shown on the partial site plan. Previously the applicant stated that the hammerhead*

utilizing the private street, Vista del Valle, was approvable by the Fire District, but this proved not to be the case and the Fire District required an alternative with a lower, acceptable cross slope. This reconfigured turnaround is oriented perpendicular to the contours, spans ~60-ft. horizontally and ~19- ft. vertically. This results in 19-ft. retaining walls – a 7.5-ft. (max) wall for fill below the turn around and an 11.5-ft. (max) wall for cut above the turn around.

4. No Evidence of Domestic & Fire Suppression Water Supply

The application did not identify the location and provision of EBMUD water or tanks for fire suppression & domestic water. Contra Costa County Fire Protection District considers hillside properties in Lafayette particularly susceptible to wildland/urban fires. Previous testimony was that the property was served by EBMUD, which is not the case.

The applicant has submitted an email from the neighbor stating he will provide water if EBMUD does not. The applicant has stated that an application has been submitted to LAFCO to annex the property into the EBMUD service area. ~~To date, neither To that end, a copy of the application to LAFCO has been submitted nor a letter from LAFCO acknowledging receipt of the application and status thereof and is attached to this report.~~

5. Plans did not show a public trail easement along the ridge

Pursuant to the Planning Commission's direction on May 5, 2005, the plans should show a public trail easement along the existing ridge trail connecting from the Lindberg property on the north, to the Soldier Field Partners property on the south. Parks, Trails & Recreation staff can assist you with a detailed layout upon request.

The plans ~~have been revised to do not~~ show "the approximate location of a future trail easement" (Ward Young letter, 12/22/2006), ~~however and~~ the applicant's written response states that "I will gladly grant a trail easement as long as I can build a reasonable house in a reasonable amount of time."

6. Submittals did not include Hydrology Report

The submittals lacked a hydrology report pursuant to the Planning Commission's May 19, 2005 findings #6(i), with particular focus on the ability of downstream facilities to handle stormwater flowing down the swale beneath the proposed residence. Multiple site visits have shown damage to Vista del Valle from excessive flow and testimony from adjacent property owners highlighted their concerns on adequate drainage facilities being implemented.

The submittals of December 22, 2006 do ~~not~~ contain ~~any~~ additional analysis ~~or and~~ information on how the ~~project will installation of Vista del Valle handles~~ storm drainage and mitigate impacts on downslope neighbors.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Planning staff has reviewed the project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and has determined that the project is categorically exempt under §15303(a) "One single-family residence, or a second dwelling unit in a residential zone."

PUBLIC RESPONSE

New public notices were sent to all property owners within 500-ft. of the subject property for the Planning Commission meeting of January 18, 2007. To date, no additional public comment has been received.

HDP83-05 MEETING HISTORY

Body	Date	Notes
DRC	08/08/2006	Continued, without consideration, to DRC 8/22/2006.
DRC	08/22/2006	Continued without consideration to the Special DRC Meeting of 9/5/2006 due to the late hour.
DRC	09/5/2006	Continued to DRC 9/26/2006 if applicant agreed to PSA extension. Forward comments to PC otherwise.
DRC	09/26/2006	Continued, without consideration, at the applicant's request to DRC 10/10/2006 to allow the applicant to submit revised plans based on DRC's comments.
PC	10/05/2006	Continued, without consideration, to PC 10/19/2006 to allow the DRC to consider revised plans on October 10, 2006 and forward a recommendation to the Planning Commission.
DRC	10/10/2006	Recommendation and comments to be provided for PC 10/19/2006.
PC	10/19/2006	PC determined critical information was missing and continued the matter.
PC	11/02/2006	Applicant withdrew application to allow for adequate time to prepare 2,500 sq.ft. design requested by the Planning Commission in May 2005.
-	12/01/2006	Applicant submitted revised plans which showed a 2,500 sq.ft. outline over the proposed floor plan. Staff determined this was not a 2,500 sq.ft. design.
-	12/22/2006	Applicant submitted revised plans which showed a 2,500 sq.ft. design including floor plans and elevations. Fire district review outstanding.
PC	01/18/2007	To be determined.

ANALYSIS AND COMMENTS • (based on plans received 9/22/2006)

Access	The Contra Costa County Fire Protection District has provided general comments on the standards that will need to be met by the project (see attached referral response), but has not specifically indicated that the project meets (or does not meet) the standards as currently designed. The applicant has not provided a letter or stamped site plan showing the Fire Protection District has reviewed the proposed turn around and found it complies with District standards.
---------------	--

<p>Architecture</p>	<p>The revised architecture remains unique and clearly an attempt to respond to the numerous constraints and challenges of the site, foremost being off site visibility. The house is bunkered into the hill to a significant degree.</p> <p>The design utilizes a very low 3:12 roof pitch, deep roof overhangs and dark colors (except the stucco retaining wall color, which staff finds needs to be darker) to help minimize the apparent height, bulk and mass of the structure.</p> <p>The project includes ~1,200 sq.ft. of outdoor living space in the form of decks & patios.</p>
<p>Landscaping</p>	<p>The revised landscape plan utilizes only Coast Live Oak and Valley Oak - species native to the area – and the number of trees proposed has been significantly reduced from the initial design to a total of seven trees, in response to the recommendation of the Design Review Commission.</p> <p><i>A similar landscape plan requiring limited, small trees was required for the Liviakis project on Burton Ridge built in 2000, which remains highly visible to this day. This, compared to the significant existing evergreen vegetation that provides substantial screening for the Lindberg project immediately to the north on Burton Ridge.</i></p> <p>Staff finds the landscape plan needs to be significantly bolstered with additional native trees and shrubs, with the understanding that it would take decades for the few proposed trees to significantly screen the house and retaining walls because of the verticality of the site (trees have to grow taller), the challenging growing conditions with respect to sun and wind exposure, water and soil conditions, and the limited size of specimens that can be successfully transplanted.</p>
<p>Drainage</p>	<p>The submitted drainage plan is highly schematic at this time and shows three dissipaters below the house (without details). Item 6(i) from the Planning Commission’s findings on May 19, 2005 states that because of concerns raised by property owners down slope of the project site, it is important to have a hydrology study performed and drainage plan developed for review by the City Engineer early in the review process. Such a study has not yet been submitted to the City Engineer whose comments are attached and advise of adverse drainage conditions/erosion currently on site below the subject home site.</p> <p>The Design Review Commission has asked the applicant to investigate the downstream storm drain capacity and incorporate a secondary (‘failsafe’) system which could handle storm runoff in the event the primary system failed.</p> <p><i>The submittals received December 22, 2006 do not include a hydrology report or any additional analysis as to the adequacy of the proposed dissipater or downstream infrastructure to accommodate site drainage. The applicant has continued to argue against the necessity of any additional hydrological studies, information or designs, however neither the project civil engineer nor the City Engineer have advised in writing that the hydrology report requested by the Planning Commission is not warranted.</i></p>
<p>Water & Fire Suppression</p>	<p>The Fire Protection District has conducted an initial review of the project and provided general comments with respect to the standards that the project will need to meet. The applicant has previously indicated that the project will be served by</p>

	<p>EMBUD water, however a referral response from EBMUD indicates that the property is outside the districts service area and annexation would need to be applied for and approved by the Contra Costa County Local Area Formation Commission (LAFCO). This process could be time consuming and the extension of a water main to the site cost prohibitive.</p> <p>Absent some approval from LAFCO and commitment from EBMUD to serve the property, staff recommends that the project be evaluated with the understanding that it is not served by EBMUD and will require well water and storage tanks to accommodate domestic water usage and fire suppression.</p> <p><i>On November 29, 2006 the applicant forwarded an email from Eric Lindberg, the adjacent property owner to the north, stating that he would provide domestic and fire fighting water to the Strand project if EBMUD will not. The applicant has previously stated that he has applied to LAFCO to be annexed into the EBMUD water service area. To date, neither a copy of the application has been submitted nor a letter from LAFCO acknowledging receipt of the application and status thereof.</i></p>
<p>Off Site Visibility</p>	<p>Off site visibility was a component of the Planning Commission’s consideration of siting determination under file number HDP70-04. The Commission determined that the subject parcel/home site is one of, if not the most visible locations in the City of Lafayette. This results, in part, from the elevation of the site, the slope/contours of the landforms, and the nearly complete lack of screening vegetation (the site is barren of screening trees downslope of the building site). With this understanding, a foremost goal of the Hillside Development Permit and design review consideration must be mitigation of off site visual impacts to the maximum extent practicable.</p> <p>Tools to mitigate off site visual impacts include appropriate siting, minimizing square footage/volume, low roof ridge heights, low roof pitches, deep roof overhangs to create shadows, articulating the bulk and mass, utilizing dark colors and materials, minimizing grading, minimizing removal of and impacts on screening trees, and landscape screening.</p> <p>The plans received September 22, 2006 distributed to the Planning Commission for review showed a single-family residence with a gross floor area of ~4,000 sq.ft. This is ~1,500 sq.ft. (60%) larger than the than the Planning Commission’s direction to begin with a 2,500 sq.ft. design including 2-car garage.</p> <p><i>Plans submitted December 22, 2006 show a single-family residence with a gross floor area of 3,964 sq.ft. as well as a 2,541 sq.ft. design, including floor plans and elevations. The bulk of the difference is square footage between the 3,964 sq.ft. and 2,541 sq.ft. designs results from eliminating two bedrooms on the basement level. While the entry is eliminated and the dining, living and kitchen are reduced, the width of the house across the hill remains essentially unchanged. Thus, the elevation drawings for 3,964 sq.ft. and 2,541 sq.ft. designs are not significantly different. This could be interpreted to mean that a ~2,500 sq.ft. house has essentially the same visual impacts as a ~4,000 sq.ft. house. Alternatively, it could result from the illustrated ~2,500 sq.ft. design not differing substantially from the ~4,000 sq.ft. design.</i></p> <p><i>Since the width of the main floor plan essentially remained the same, it follows that the visual impacts of the west elevation would be essentially the same. However, if</i></p>

	<p><i>the width of the house were reduced (which has been the direction from the Planning Commission since siting determination in May 2005) the visual impacts would also be reduced. For example, the master suite could take the place of Bedrooms #3 & #4 on the lower lever, thus accommodating additional square footage, yet still reducing the off-site visual impacts of the bulk and mass of the upper floor.</i></p> <p><i>By eliminating square footage from the basement in the ~2,500 sq.ft. design, the architect has not realized a commensurate reduction in visibility that would result from reduction of the same square footage on the upper floor.</i></p>
--	--

REQUIRED FINDINGS

The following findings must be made by the Planning Commission in order to approve the requested permits. Staff cannot make the underlined findings at this time.

§6-2067 General findings required for a hillside development permit

- A. The development is consistent with the applicable goals and policies of the general plan and is in conformance with applicable zoning regulations;
- B. The development will preserve open space and physical features, including rock outcroppings and other prominent geological features, streams, streambeds and ponds, native vegetation, native riparian vegetation, animal habitats and other natural features;
- C. The development and each associated improvement is located and designed to complement the natural terrain and landscape of the site and surrounding properties, and relates to the development pattern, including density and distribution, of the surrounding neighborhood;
- D. Structures in a hillside overlay district will, to the extent feasible, be located away from prominent locations such as ridgelines, hilltops, knolls and open slopes.
- E. Development grading will be minimized to reduce cut and fill, preserve existing geologic features, topographic conditions and existing vegetation, reduce short and long-term erosion, slides and flooding, and abate visual impacts;
- F. Each structure proposed complies with the city’s residential design guidelines, and development landscaping will ensure visual relief and complement each proposed structure to provide an attractive environment; and
- G. The development will not create a nuisance, hazard or enforcement problem within the neighborhood or the city, nor require the city to provide an unusual or disproportionate level of public services.
- H. The new or replacement vegetation for the development is native to the surrounding area in areas abutting open space and natural areas, such as oak woodland, chaparral, grassland and riparian areas, excluding planting for erosion control or land stabilization.

§6-2070 Findings required for approval of development on existing lots of record in hillside overlay district.

The findings required to approve development on an existing lot of record in the hillside overlay district are the findings set forth in section 6-2067 and the following additional findings:

- A. When within a L-R-10 or L-R-5 district, within 100 feet of a restricted ridgeline area, or when a exception to a ridgeline setback has been granted, the development will result in each structure being substantially concealed when viewed from lower elevations from publicly owned property (including freeways, roadways, open space, parks and trails), using the viewing evaluation map as a guide to establish locations from which views are considered.

- B. The development uses site planning techniques to the extent feasible to preserve hillsides, knolls, ridgelines and open space, minimize grading and impacts to habitat, and preserve on-site open space and vegetation, terrain, scenic vistas, streams or other courses, or other areas of ecological significance.
- C. The development provides adequate emergency vehicle access, including turn-around space, to the building site and surrounding on-site undeveloped or isolated areas while protecting trees, minimizing grading and preserving to the extent feasible the natural hillside character of the site.
- D. The development, including site design and the location and massing of all structures and improvements will, to the extent feasible:
 - 1. Preserve the open space and uncluttered topography of the city;
 - 2. Minimize the loss of privacy to surrounding residents;
 - 3. Not have a significant visual impact when viewed from lower elevations from publicly owned properties (including freeways, roadways, open space, parks and trails), using the viewing evaluation map as a guide; and
 - 4. Not interfere with a ridgeline trail corridor or compromise the open space or scenic character of the corridor.

§6-2069 Findings required for grant of exception permitting development within class II or III ridgeline setback.

In order to grant an exception to the prohibition of development on a class II ridge imposed by section 6-2023 or on a class III ridge imposed by section 6-2024, the planning commission shall find either that:

- A. Special conditions and unique characteristics of the subject property exist and a site plan and design is such that the proposed development would provide a result that satisfies the policies in section 6-2067 and 6-2070 or 6-2071, as the case may be, and that would otherwise satisfy the strict standards of sections 6-2023 or 6-2024; or
- B. An exception is necessary to allow an economically viable use of the property and the development meets the standards in section 6-2070 or 6-2071, as the case may be. In granting an exception under this subsection B the density:
 - 1. Shall not exceed the density permitted by the slope density formula or the underlying zoning district, whichever is less; and
 - 2. Shall not exceed that necessary to avoid an unconstitutional taking of property.

§6-1905 General findings for structures over 17' in height

- 1. The structure substantially complies with the city's residential design guidelines;
- 2. The structure is so designed that it will appear compatible with the scale and style of the existing neighborhood and will not significantly detract from the established character of the neighborhood;
- 3. The structure is so designed that it does not appear too tall or massive in relation to surrounding structures or topography when viewed from off-site;
- 4. The structure is so designed that it does not unreasonably reduce the privacy or views of adjacent properties.

§6-275(b) Findings required for approval of a new residence exceeding 6,000 square feet in gross floor area.

In addition to the findings required in subsection (a) of this section, the following findings must be made for a new residence exceeding 6,000 square feet in gross floor area or an addition to an existing residence which will increase its gross floor area to over 6,000 square feet:

1. The house substantially complies with the city's residential design guidelines;
2. The house is so designed that its mass will not appear significantly out of scale with the existing neighborhood;
3. The house does not, because of its size, unduly impact, restrict or block significant views; and
4. The house does not, because of its size, require removal of natural features, require excessive grading or cause the unreasonable removal of a healthy tree(s).

Ord. 536 Findings required for approval of grading exceeding 50 cu. yds.

1. The grading will not endanger the stability of the site or adjacent property or pose a significant ground movement hazard to an adjacent property. The decision making authority may require the project geotechnical engineer to certify the suitability of the project supported by appropriate technical studies, including subsurface investigation;
2. The grading will not significantly increase erosion or flooding affecting the site or other property and will not cause impacts to riparian habitats, stream channel capacity or water quality that cannot be substantially mitigated;
3. The grading, when completed, will result in a building site that is visually compatible with the surrounding land;
4. The grading is sensitive to the existing landforms, topography and natural features on the site;
5. The design of the project preserves existing trees on the site and trees on adjoining property to the extent possible;
6. Arborist recommendations for retained trees, if any, are incorporated into the grading plans.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Consider the plans submitted December 22, 2006, take testimony from the applicant and public, and continue the matter to February 15, 2007 directing staff to prepare a denial resolution because the required findings cannot be made.

ATTACHMENTS

1. [Letter from Ward Young Architects • December 22, 2006](#)
 2. [Contra Costa County Fire Protection District Letter • December 12, 2006](#)
 3. [LAFCO Application for annexation into EBMUD service district](#)
 4. [Emails indicating Lindberg will provide water if EBMUD does not](#)
 5. [Reduced \(11" x 17"\) plans submitted December 22, 2006](#)
 6. [Hydrology information submitted December 22, 2006](#)
- ~~I. October 10, 2006 Staff Report & Staff Meeting Notes~~
~~H. September 5, 2006 Staff Report & Meeting Minutes~~
~~1. Maps, s and aerials and~~
~~2. 7. Application forms~~
~~3. 8. City Engineer Review Memorandum • August 4, 2006~~
~~4. 9. City Consulting Traffic Engineer Review Memorandum • August 8, 2006~~
~~5. 10. InsideOut, City Landscape Consultant Review Memo • August 9, 2006~~

- ~~6-11.~~ East Bay Municipal Utility District Review Memo • August 2, 2006
- ~~7-12.~~ East Bay Regional Park District Review Letter • August 8, 2006
- ~~8.~~ ~~Contra Costa County~~ Contra Costa County Fire Protection District Review Memo • August 11, 2006
- 13.
- ~~9.~~ ~~Contra Costa County Building Inspection Department Review Email~~ • August 9, 2006
- ~~10.~~ ~~Trails Subcommittee, Lafayette Parks, Trails & Recreation Commission~~ • August 1, 2006
- ~~11.~~ Public comment
 - ~~a.~~ ~~Mr. & Mrs. Norman Gorsuch, 2100 Skyerest Drive, #7 Walnut Creek~~ • July 31, 2006
 - ~~b.~~ ~~Scott Robinson email~~ • August 7, 2006
- ~~12.~~ ~~Project plans received September 22, 2006~~
- ~~13.~~ ~~Story Pole Diagram received August 9, 2006~~
- ~~14.~~ ~~Aerial Photo provided by staff~~
- ~~15.~~ ~~PC Preferred Location Exhibit from Jeanne Ateljevich~~ • May 19, 2005

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Scope of work	Plans Received August 9, 2006	Plans Received September 22, 2006	Plans Rec'd December 22, 2006 3,964 sq.ft. Design	Plans Rec'd December 22, 2006 2,541 sq.ft. Design
Gross Floor Area	Main levels: 2,224 sq.ft. Lower level: 1,255 sq.ft. Garage: 529 sq.ft. Gross: 4,000 sq.ft. Patios: 1,797 sq.ft.	Upper & Main levels: 2,038 sq.ft. Lower level: 1,375 sq.ft. Garage: 551 sq.ft. Gross: 3,964 sq.ft. Patios: 1,190 sq.ft.	Upper & Main levels: 2,038 sq.ft. Lower level: 1,375 sq.ft. Garage: 551 sq.ft. Gross: 3,964 sq.ft. Patios: (NOT CALLED OUT)	Upper & Main levels: 1,378 sq.ft. Lower level: 656 sq.ft. Garage: 507 sq.ft. Gross: 2,541 sq.ft. Patios: (NOT CALLED OUT)
Grading	Cut: 975 CY Import: 0 CY Fill: 165 CY Export: 810 CY Total: 1140 CY	Cut: 975 CY Import: 0 CY Fill: 165 CY Export: 810 CY Total: 1140 CY	Cut: 1,200 CY Import: 0 CY Fill: 300 CY Export: 900 CY Total: 1,500 CY	Cut: 1,000 CY Import: 0 CY Fill: 300 CY Export: 700 CY Total: 1,300 CY
Height	27'-0" per Zoning Code (avg. low grade to midpoint of the highest roof plane) 31'-0" low grade to highest ridge	26'-6"-ft. per Zoning Code (avg. low grade to midpoint of the highest roof plane) Called out as 23'-6" on plans. 28'-0" low grade to highest ridge	26'-6"-ft. per Zoning Code (avg. low grade to midpoint of the highest roof plane) 28'-0" low grade to highest ridge	26'-6"-ft. per Zoning Code (avg. low grade to midpoint of the highest roof plane) 28'-0" low grade to highest ridge
Impervious surface	House: 2,760 sq.ft. Patios: 1,360 sq.ft. Driveway: 3,386 sq.ft. Total: 7,506 sq.ft.	House: 2,783 sq.ft. Patios: 1,190 sq.ft. Driveway (on & off site): 6,800 sq.ft. Total: 10,773 sq.ft.	House: 3,490 sq.ft. Patios: 120 sq.ft. Driveway (on & off site): 4,990 sq.ft. Total: 8,600 sq.ft.	House: 2,566 sq.ft. Patios: 180 sq.ft. Driveway (on & off site): 4,990 sq.ft. Total: 7,736 sq.ft.
Colors & Materials	Materials: stucco Body: dark gray & green Windows/Planter/Gutter/Fascia: copper Roof: Asphalt Comp. "Barkwood" Ret. Walls: light tan colored concrete	Materials: wood board & batten siding Body Color: "Olive Brown"* Trim & Windows: "Olympic 711"* Gutters: not specified Roof: Asphalt Comp. "Balsam Forest" Retaining Walls: medium light gray stucco • color "Southern Moss"	Unchanged from September 22, 2006 submittal.	Unchanged from September 22, 2006 submittal.

* appears to be a dark brown semi-transparent wood stain on the color board

SOURCE: Plans submitted by Ward Young Architects